

Islamic Guidance On Justice In The Context Of Gender

By
Dr. Zeenath kausar

CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Injustice in the Name of ‘Gender Justice’	5
Background	5
Okin’s Book	6
Gender Feminism	7
Gender as Social Construct	9
Domestic Activities	11
Motherhood Under Attack	13
Natural Institutions	15
Islamic Mission of Justice	17
Gender Roles	19
Role Specification	22
Muslim Societies	23

Chapter 2

Baser Motives Behind the Slogan of Gender Justice	29
Baser Motives	30
False Conception of Rights	31
Morally Unregulated Sex	33
Vision	35
Mission	35
Core Values	35

Promotion of Immorality	36
Cultural Aggression	38
Issue of Abortion	40
Permissiveness	42
Victims of Deception	43
Concept of Ethical Boundaries	45
Rejection of Illegitimate Sex	46

Chapter 1

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

In the Name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful!

Injustice in the Name of ‘Gender Justice’

Background

The term Gender Justice is one of the topmost concepts within the modern feminist literature and Human Rights movement in the West. Several books and articles authored by feminists on this concept of ‘Gender Justice’ have attracted young and old around the world. Furthermore, hundreds of NGOs which are working on the main Agenda – ‘Women’s Empowerment’ – are all streamed towards achieving ‘Gender Equality’ and ‘Gender Justice’, based on a specific feminist perspective, known as ‘gender perspective’. Thus intellectual as well as practical political efforts at international level are directed by highly influential feminists to achieve ‘Gender Justice’. For a systematic study and a critical analysis of this concept, it seems better to study it under two broad topics, one, its stance on ‘gender’, gender differences, and natural institutions, marriage and family and the other, on its International Politics on ‘sexuality and reproduction justice’ although both are related to each other. In this article we would look into the first topic, ‘Gender Justice’ on Gender, Gender Differences, Marriage and Family.

Okin's Book

As mentioned above, there are several important works on 'Gender Justice' that need a comprehensive discussion. However, for this article, we are selecting an Award Winning work, *Justice, Gender and the Family*, published in 1989, but still influencing the discussion on the topic. Susan Moller Okin, the author of this work, was hailed as a Co-Winner of the American Political Science Association's 1990 Victoria Schuck Award for this work, as the best book(s) published in 1989 on the feminist critique of modern political theory. This book proved to be eye-catching and path-breaking and became very much influential.

In this book, Susan Okin argues that unless gender justice is established in the family, justice cannot be established in the society. She then elaborates how gender justice may be established in the family. According to her, the main source of the problem of justice in family and in society is 'gender'. Before we move into the topic, it is important to know a few important points. First thing is, Susan Okin is categorised under Gender feminists who look at the terms 'sex' and 'gender' different from each other, for which reason, they are called Gender Feminists. Next, in the contemporary feminist discourse, their definitions of 'gender' are dominant and all international documents on women's issues follow this definition of 'gender'.

Next, we should know about this category, Gender Feminism. For this, we should bear in mind that Feminism is not just one theory of women's rights, but over time it has become a political ideology keeping under its umbrella several influential schools of

thought, including Liberal, Socialist, Marxist, Psychoanalytical, Existentialist, Radical, Post-Modern and several others. Besides these main categorisations, there are some other categories under which some of these schools or some feminists of these schools are categorised. One of the highly influential and extremely radical categories is 'Gender Feminism' under which several schools of Feminism are grouped.

Gender Feminism

Contemporary discussion on 'Gender Justice' is mainly initiated under 'Gender Feminism' by the 'Gender Feminists'. Some of the prominent Gender Feminists include Adrienne Rich, Judith Butler, Heidi Hartmann, Alison Jaggar, Bella Abzug and many more. It is also important to note that the discussion on 'Gender Justice' is based on the difference which the Gender Feminists point out between 'gender' and 'sex'. What is that difference? When a society assigns certain roles to men and women based on the biological differences between them, the society creates its own concepts of male and female functions, exaggerating the biological differences between men and women based on its own bias and prejudices against women. Thus the roles and functions which a given society allocates to men and women based on their biological differences in family and in society which are co-mingled with the biased and unfounded assumptions of society are referred to by all these gender feminists as 'socially created roles and functions' based on 'gender', not based on 'sex'. Thus the Gender Feminists argue that there is a virtual difference between 'sex' and 'gender'. 'Sex' is biological and 'gender' is social. On this premises,

they define ‘Gender Justice’ as the establishment of ‘justice’ in family and in society freed from ‘gender’.

So coming back to Susan Okin, she argues that unless family and society as a whole is made free from this socially created ‘gender’, justice cannot be established in family or in society. In this whole discussion, an important point to note is the emphasis on ‘socially constructed roles’ which according to Susan Okin and other gender feminists have nothing to do much with the biological differences between men and women and more to do with the social images and assumptions on women which are mainly based on hatred and prejudices against women to keep them inferior to men. Susan Okin draws the conclusion that abolition of ‘gender’ is therefore inevitable to stop all kinds of injustices women face in family and in society. With this in mind, she proposed for a ‘gender-free society’. Such a perception on ‘gender’ and some more related ideas in this connection are commonly referred to as ‘gender perspective’.

Having said this, it is important to understand how Susan Okin looks at ‘marriage’ and ‘family’ from her ‘gender perspective’ on the basis of which she builds her concept of ‘justice’ in family and society. Susan Okin contends that woman becomes vulnerable as soon as she gets married, because marriage is a ‘gendered structure’, based on ‘gender’ which stands on the division of labour in which women are expected to take care of the house and children whereas men are expected to take over the work outside. Thus women suffer exploitation and injustice through marriage depending on men for their life and for the life of their children. Marriage in a way, according to Susan Okin, brings women under dependency of men who try to

exploit women for their own advantage. Thus family which is a creation of this marriage becomes a pivot of 'gendered system' where women face nothing but exploitation and injustice.

She observes: "The family is the linchpin of 'gender', reproducing it from one generation to the next. As we have seen, family life as typically practised in our society is not just, either to women or to children.... Women are made vulnerable by constructing their lives around the expectation that they will be primary parents; they become more vulnerable within marriages in which they fulfil this expectation...." (See Susan Okin, *Justice, Gender and the Family*, Harper Collins, 1989, p.170.)

Gender as Social Construct

A critical analysis of this whole concept of gender justice as presented by Susan Okin cannot be made unless we understand the main reason behind such a low perception of these institutions, 'marriage' and 'family' by the Gender Feminists because such low images in some way or the other are reinforced through 'social construction of gender'. Social construction of gender in simple words is the creation of certain concepts, notions, customs and traditions by the society which become dominant in the society as established facts and people are socialised and indoctrinated to follow them. How does a society form these notions, norms and traditions? Society forms these norms and traditions on the basis of some dominant faith-systems or ideologies of the given society and sometimes, the society creates these norms and traditions mixing some beliefs and principles of its faith systems and ideologies with some general

assumptions and some age-old customs, etc. The problem is, often, the social construction on 'gender' is built on some belief systems mixed with certain assumptions and general notions of the people which reflect bias and prejudice against women. This is the experience not only in some Western societies, but also in some Eastern societies, including some Muslim societies. (We shall discuss Muslim society later in the article.)

Keeping the above discussion into consideration, we agree with Susan Okin on one point, but disagree with all the rest of her points and her conclusion. What do we agree with her? No doubt, as long as problems like male domination and female subjection in some families, domestic violence, sexexploitation, gender-discrimination in family and at workplace outside family are concerned, it can be said that Susan Okin is right because most of these problems are created due to the social construction of 'gender', i.e. the general negative conception of society on women. The general negative conception of society on women can be summed up in these words – women should remain inferior to men and they need not be allowed to assume any central position in family and society and men should always be at par from women marginalising them in every sphere of life. Hence, we do not deny the problem of the 'social construction of gender' in the West because the problem exists in varying degrees across the world and this problem should be addressed, because construction of male and female relationship in terms of inferior and superior positions should not be acceptable to any society, including the Muslim society.

Domestic Activities

What do we disagree with her? We do not agree with Susan Okin on her total disregard of the biological differences between men and women and their resultant implications in the functions of life in family and in society. For instance, according to Susan Okin, women face exploitation and injustice in a family where men are the bread-winners and women are the care-takers of the house and children. Susan points out that 'on average women earn 79 cents for every dollar earned by men' and that this inequality between men and women is due to the 'unpaid labour' women undertake in the family, particularly where the responsibility of children is primarily accorded to women. Susan then, like other feminists, describe the house-work and child-care as 'unpaid domestic labour'.

We question here in the first place as to why the house-work and child-care are perceived in such 'low esteem' to define that these types of works are the unpaid domestic labour and should be considered symbols of 'injustice' while the 'bread-winning work' is justified with high esteem? Aren't both these types of work, inside and outside the house performed for the same cause, family? Why then the inside-house work should be perceived as low labour and unjust work while the outside house work should be perceived as high and preferable? We therefore argue that the problem of this concept, gender justice lies in the perception of the feminists – how they see the house-work and child-care work and the work outside.

In fact, we present our counter-argument – that those who look at the house-work and child-care work as low, unjust and un-paid work are themselves

creating ‘work injustice’ in the name of ‘gender justice’. House-work and child-care works are basic and fundamental works without which a family cannot be established in the same way as ‘bread-winning’ is essential for supporting the family financially. Neither the work inside the family nor the work outside the family can be underestimated or overestimated; both these works complement each other for a smooth and peaceful running of a family. By the same token, both types of work should be perceived with due justice so that justice be established. It is sheer injustice to underestimate the house-work and child-care in the name of ‘gender justice’ and overestimate the outside work as much higher and more preferable than the house-work. Hence, problem does not lie in the different natures of the work; problem lies in the perception of the gender feminists who perceive different works – inside and outside works in an unjust way, proving the outside work for earning as justified and respectful while the house-work and child-care as unjustified, unpaid and disrespectful.

We dare to comment here that feminists, who claim that they stand against gender discrimination have ended up in creating, what we call ‘work discrimination’ based on their own feministically created higher and lower and paid and un-paid roles in family and society. If certain socially constructed roles are unjust, these kinds of feministically constructed ‘work discriminations’ are also unjust.

On this, if Susan Okin argues back and say that fine, if both inside and outside works are equally important and necessary, why women alone should be expected to take up the house-work and why men should be expected to take the financial responsibility

Here, we would like to get her attention on the biological differences between men and women. We would like to raise a question: Are all the gender differences of men and women simply socially constructed? Are the natural differences between men and women not the creation of nature, creation of God who created men and women differently? For instance, one of the important and noble functions of woman is 'motherhood'. During this whole process of the reproduction period, there are times when women cannot take up the outside financial responsibility as there is some obligation on her, despite all the medical advancement in reproduction technology.

Motherhood Under Attack

What women should do in this situation? Should they forsake motherhood? Hence, it is important that women should be legally exempted from taking the financial responsibility of the family as obligation on them. This does not mean that women should be totally denied to share the financial responsibility in the family or that they should be totally denied to work outside in all circumstances. But, it is but natural that the financial role should not be assigned to them as legal obligation. It is totally a different thing if women take up the outside work on their own 'choice' based on their circumstances and arrangements; this is not a compulsion on them, rather their selection. As for men, it is a legal obligation on them to financially support their family; a compulsion, not a selection, because they are biologically fit for this role when compared to women. Hence, biological differences between men and women cannot be totally discarded nor can the

practical resultant differences of certain gender role be condemned.

Child-bearing, child-birth and child-weaning can be performed only by women, not men because they are biologically different from each other. It is totally different thing that men should give their full cooperation to women during this situation in whatever way possible. But cooperation is one thing and undergoing complete process of reproduction is another thing. However, according to the Gender Feminists there is nothing natural or biological in women to think that 'motherhood' is important and fundamental for women. How far it is justified to look at motherhood not naturally and biologically important for women? Undermining 'womanhood' implies creating 'conflict' within the nature of woman which loves and rejoices 'motherhood' because it appeals to her nature.

It may be argued that 'reproduction role' of a woman does not continue the whole life and why then she should be confined within house all her life. We totally agree with this argument. We never say that women should end up her life shutting herself within four walls of the house. But men and women on this planet, earth, are living under various circumstances and various conditions. For instance, there may be some cases where women have small children and there is nobody to look after them and they cannot go to better childcare centres or they cannot afford to do so. Besides these, there may be cases, where the old parents must be staying with them and they need to be cared for. What these women should do? Should they send their children to whatever child-care centres and send the old parents to the old-age homes so that the

go outside to work, earn and attain this so-called 'gender justice'? Are they doing 'justice' to children and 'justice' to old parents? This is not 'justice'; this is manipulation of the term, 'justice'!

The crucial point to understand here is that if these feminists demand for equal opportunities to men and women for outside work and professions, we agree with them, provided they are not neglecting their family obligations. In fact, we would rather say that women should not be forced to stay at home all the time and they should be given opportunities to go for higher education and to contribute their services to society. In other words, neither women should be forced to stay inside the house being deprived from attaining knowledge, gaining professional skills and developing their personalities based on their interest, in the name of 'justice', nor women should be forced to work outside in all circumstances, creating problems to family members particularly to small children and old or sick members of the family, in the name of 'justice'. In both the cases, 'force' cannot be justified because the natural differences between men and women can be neither marginalised nor can they be exploited. Furthermore, it may be argued that there are some families around the world, where women alone are the earning members for some or the other reasons. Here we can say that there can be exceptions and exceptions cannot be generalised for the whole society.

Natural Institutions

But the problem of the feminists (not all the feminists, for instance equity feminists who are pro-family), the ones who are highly influential even at the international level, including the Gender Feminists, is

that they tend to abolish gender differences and either undermine or believe in the abolition of natural institutions – marriage, family and motherhood. Based on this confused understanding of ‘gender justice’, they contend that ‘marriage’ is one of the biggest causes of creating ‘inequality’ and ‘injustice’ through enslavement of women, and thus keep women dependent on men and tie them with children all the time. Therefore, they believe that women should be forced to leave the house and work outside. This can be understood from a dialogue of a highly influential feminist, Simon de Beauvoir when she was talking to another great feminist, Betty Friedan. Simon de Beauvoir said:

“No, we don’t believe that women should have this choice. No woman should be authorised to stay at home to raise her children. Society should be totally different....”

(See Betty Friedan, “It changed my life: writings on the women’s movement,” Random House, 1976, pp. 311-312.)

This is one of the mind-sets within which framework, the natural differences between men and women and natural institutions are described as ‘socially constructed’ by those who uphold this feminist concept of ‘gender justice’. This further leads to a conflict between men and women because this framework creates two gender camps of men and women fighting and undermining each other. This is the obvious result of not respecting the natural differences between each other while duly acknowledging the basic equality of each other as human beings and co-partners of a marital family life.

Besides all these, another question may be raised here: Why shouldn’t the ‘choice’ be given to women,

whether to take up the house-work or to take up the house-work and the out-side work with cooperation from men and other necessary arrangements? Is this 'gender justice' to deprive women of making their own choice and suggesting them to keep from the marriage itself? One of the known statements of feminists on marriage may be cited here: "All the discriminatory practices against women are patterned and rationalized by this slavery-like practice (of marriage). We can't destroy the inequities between men and women until we destroy marriage" (See Robin Morgan, ed., *Sisterhood is Powerful*, 1970, p.537.)

We would like to comment here that if marriage is exploited as slavery to men, we should abolish 'slavery to men', not marriage, because marriage as such is not enslavement, rather a loving and peaceful marital companionship. The point to understand here is that if we tread the path of abolishing the natural differences between men and women, we would end up in abolishing all the natural institutions, marriage, family and motherhood. How far this concept of 'gender justice' can then be justified when it does not do justice to natural differences and eventually leads to the destruction of natural and fundamental institutions of a society, 'marriage' and 'family'? Are we heading towards creating a civilization, 'marriage-free' and 'family-free'? Such a civilization would fall short of calling it a 'civilization' and such a concept of 'gender justice' would fall short of calling 'gender justice'; it would be rather befitting to call it, 'gender injustice'!

Islamic Mission of Justice

Let us see the position of Islam on gender justice. To begin with, one has to understand, that since Islam

is revealed to man from Allah, then, it is but natural that Islam ensures justice to both man and woman, because Allah would not do injustice to any of His creation, not even to any animal or to a piece of grass. In fact, the Qur'ān says that the very purpose of Allah to send the Prophets onto the earth had been nothing but to establish justice and peace on earth. It implies that 'justice' is an integral part of Islam, not outside it; it is in the nature, purpose and mission of Islam. The Qur'ān says:

"We sent Our Messengers with clear signs and sent down with them the Book and the Measure in order to establish justice among the people...." (Quran 57:25)

This being said let us move forward. We would like to mention here that we would come straight to those issues which are emphasised in the feminist concept of gender justice as discussed above, so that we can see the stance of Islam on those specific issues.

In the first place, we see that Islam fully recognises the natural differences between men and women, because it is Allah alone Who has created all things in pairs which are produced from the earth and from mankind and those things of which we have no knowledge. The Qur'ān says:

"Exalted is He who created all pairs – from what the earth grows and from themselves and from that which they do not know." (Al Qur'ān, 36:36)

"He who has made for you the earth like a carpet spread out; has enabled you to go about therein by roads (and channels); and has sent down water from the sky. With it, We have produced diverse pairs of plants each separate from the others."

(Al Qur'ān, 20:53)

Several other verses in the Qur'ān can be cited here in this connection. (See 13:3; 51:49; 43:12)

This shows that gender differences are the creation of God, not man-made or society-made. Now, the next point is why these ‘pairs’ and gender differences are created by Allah? Creation of pairs and gender differences are made so that human beings should reflect over these signs of the existence and the sovereignty of Allah and stay in peace and happiness with each other following Him. The Qur’ān says:

“And it is He who spread the earth and placed therein firmly set mountains and rivers; and from all of the fruits He made therein two mates; He causes the night to cover the day. Indeed in that are signs for a people who give thought.” (Al Qur’ān, 13:3)

“And of all things We created two mates; perhaps you will reflect.” (Al Qur’ān, 51:49)

“And of His signs is that He created for you from yourselves mates that you may find tranquillity in them; and He placed between you affection and mercy. Indeed in that are signs for a people who give thought.” (Al Qur’ān, 30:21)

From the above we understand that natural differences are not only the Creation of God, but there is a high purpose behind creating the natural differences between males and females, so that people may think, reflect, and submit to Allah.

Gender Roles

Next, the question arises whether Allah has specified certain gender roles on the basis of the natural differences? We find that Allah being the Creator of men and women and all the things in the universe, took a unique approach in framing the relationship between men and women while keeping ‘basic equality’ between them intact and protecting the

'natural differences' between them with due regards. (Please keep this note for understanding the issue of 'equality' in Islam and Feminism. Remember that by 'basic equality', or 'gender equality in Islam', we refer to the egalitarian principle of Islam which looks at men and women as basically equal while appreciating the natural differences between them. 'Basic equality in Islam' is different from the 'absolute equality of Feminism' which ignores the natural differences between men and women and defines equality in terms of 'sameness'.)

Hence, on one side the Qur'ān has mostly mentioned the 'basic equality' of men and women in the sense of one mankind, (Al Qur'ān, 4:1); one purpose of creation for both, (Al Qur'ān, 51:56); the trust of knowledge given to both, (Al Qur'ān, 2:31-33); same rewards and punishments on their deeds, (Al Qur'ān, 16:9); and the same rewards for good qualities attributed to men and women, (Al Qur'ān, 33:35); men and women as protectors of one another, (Al Qur'ān, 9:71) and as co-vicegerents of Allah, (Al Qur'ān, 2:30; 6:165). On the other side, the Qur'ān points out certain specific gender roles for men and women while keeping into consideration the biological differences between men and women. The Qur'ān says:

"Men are the maintainers of women because Allah has made some of them to excel others and because they spend out of their property." (Al Qur'ān, 4:34)

We cannot go at length here discussing the various interpretations of this verse. Sufficient here is to say that according to a great majority of the commentators and interpreters of the Qur'ān, men are accorded the financial responsibility for women and children

because generally men excel women in physical strength. So here, there are two important points that are often emphasised; one is the financial obligation of men to take care of family and the physical capability of men. Hence for these reasons, men are accorded the position as ‘the maintainers’ of women and children, called ‘Qawwamoon’.

Along with this verse, it is also important to see that the Qur’ān has mentioned specifically the great responsibility of woman of child-bearing, child -birth and child-weaning.

“And We have enjoined upon man, to his parents, good treatment. His mother carried him with hardship and gave birth to him with hardship, and his gestation and weaning [period] is thirty months.” (Al Qur’ān, 46:15)

It is pertinent to see that the Qur’ān has mentioned both these institutions here, motherhood and fatherhood, but extra emphasis is paid in the Qur’ān to see the biggest function that a mother undergoes while bearing a child and giving birth to a child and taking care of the weaning responsibility. Since Allah possesses absolute knowledge that women are biologically different from men, and that men are made free from the long process of reproduction and its related functions, men are assigned the financial responsibility in legal and obligatory terms and women are exempted from it. Exemption does not mean here forbidden. Women can share the financial responsibility with men and even can keep their earning for themselves, but this financial responsibility is not a legal obligation on them.

Role Specification

Serious reflections on this whole arrangement reveal that this specification of gender roles is based on 'gender justice, social justice and justice in a comprehensive sense'. A very crucial point that is often missed out in this discussion is that one should understand the difference between legal obligation and individual selection based on one's choice. Legal obligation is something that cannot be forsaken while an individual selection based on choice can be forsaken by the will of the person, because it is not his or her legal obligation. Keeping this in mind, one can easily understand that a woman who undergoes a long period of reproduction function, by right cannot be given the financial responsibility as legal obligation, because there can be many circumstances of her health situation in which she would not be able to perform this responsibility as a legal obligation. It is the very question of justice that women in such special conditions of reproduction should be totally exempted from serious and tedious work only for the sake of earning. Hence, we argue that demands of the feminists that women should work outside in all circumstances without which they would suffer injustice is by itself based on injustice against women themselves.

Here the main problem of feminism, as said earlier, lies in their contention that unless women do the same as men they are unequal to men and hence deprived of gender justice. They fail to understand that justice does not mean only to give the same role and same treatment. Justice in the real sense implies to give the suitable role and fair treatment to each person. If you give a heavy piece of stone to men to hold and

give the same to women is neither equality nor justice. We would emphasise here that equality and justice demand suitable opportunity and fair treatment. If we ignore fairness, we will surely end up in darkness of injustice. If we ignore suitability, we will end up in brutality. We should be fair and just to both genders and be never unjust and brutal to any of them.

Furthermore, in Islam, neither ‘marriage’ is an issue of enslavement of wife, nor ‘family’ a lynchpin of inequality and injustice where husband and wife are struggling against each other for empowerment in the name of ‘gender justice’. Marriage in Islam is a noble and virtuous institution which binds male and female human beings and makes them one and united in a peaceful family with love and mutual concern for each other which Allah has bestowed in them as one of His signs. (Al Qur’ān, 30:21; 16:72)

Muslim Societies

But, mind you, this discussion cannot be ended here unless we critically analyse the practical interpretations of the above verse on gender roles in Muslim societies. We observe that some Muslim scholars based on some narrow interpretations of certain verses in the Qur’ān, including the verse, (33:33), and the above quoted verse, tend to confine women within the house all the time. We contend that such attitudes of Muslim men are not based on Islamic teachings; rather they are self-created notions and some unjustified practices of Muslim societies.

It is important to note that recognition of natural differences between men and women in Islam does not mean that we should overlook the egalitarian principle of Islam connected with ‘basic equality’ of men and

women as human beings and as co-vicegerents of Allah. Islam unlike feminism does not sacrifice the natural differences to protect the equality of women with men nor (as sometimes misrepresented) sacrifices equality for protecting natural differences. Islam does justice to both, equality and natural differences between men and women.

But we find in some Muslim families (cannot be generalised) that girls are not allowed to go for higher education and women are discouraged or deprived from working outside in any profession in the society, in the name of 'gender differences' and 'gender roles'. In what sense, 'gender differences' are invaded if Muslim women like to attain higher education? On what grounds certain 'gender roles' are seen neglected if Muslim women like to perform any role in the society while practising Islam? We criticise Gender Feminists because they are undermining gender differences and gender roles saying that this is injustice to women. 'Right.' But, what are we doing? We are over emphasising 'gender differences and gender roles' and doing injustice to women. Then don't we need a critical assessment of our unjust practices in context with women? We do. We are facing negative implications of some of our negative attitudes to our Muslim women which we justify as 'Islamic'. This is my own personal observation that a good number of well qualified and Islam-loving young girls and women are trying to find shelter under 'feminism' to uphold their rights which are guaranteed to them by the Qur'ān and Sunnah, because they were deprived from those rights from some sections of some Muslim societies. Is this a healthy phenomenon? It is a depressing phenomenon indeed! Why Muslim women,

who can be proud of Islam that it guarantees all genuine rights to them, have to bring Feminism to protect their rights? It is not fair, on their part; but some Muslim families and societies are not fair on their part with them too. Mind you, we are not justifying these women who are doing this; we can never justify them on any excuse. We would say that if we find some problems in our societies, we should address them and try to settle them following our own Islamic stance on the problems, because there is no problem that Islam cannot resolve. On the contrary, Feminism itself needs guidance on many issues from Islam; it is not *vice versa*. Hence problems within Muslim society should be resolved within Islamic framework not outside it. But we should not be too late to resolve them.

We need to understand here that despite all the attractions of Feminism for some women, there are some Muslim women around in our societies who are Islam-conscious and well-educated and they are not turning towards Feminism unlike others to stand and fight for their rights, because they find problems in Feminism too. But it is quite obvious that these Muslim women also cannot stand the narrow images that are portrayed in some Muslim families and societies that ideal Muslim women are those who shut down at home all the time. Where these Muslim women should turn for 'gender justice' in Islamic sense? Definitely they should turn towards Islam which alone can give them justice. Well then, on behalf of these Muslim women, we would like to raise a few questions here: Did the honourable wives of the Prophet, the Mothers of Muslims and the great women companions (May Allah be pleased with them all) did

not participate in various fields of socio-economic and political fields in society? Did their participation in the society meant that they neglected the ‘gender differences’ and ‘gender roles’ in families? May Allah forbid! No. Then why those Muslim women who are the lovers of Islam, devoted wives and affectionate mothers and at the same time well-educated and enlightened should be deprived from contributing their constructive services to the society in the name of ‘gender differences’ and ‘gender roles’? Why Muslim men cannot give any sort of cooperation to them and cannot encourage them? On one side we have the examples of our own Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be to him) giving the possible cooperation even in the house-chores to his wives whenever and whatever possible for him, and we have here some of our Muslim men who do not take water to drink for themselves and argue that it is the work and responsibility of their wives to give them food, drinks, clothes and every little thing they require at homes, failing which they are condemned and severely criticised. Mind you, we are here referring to those Muslim women who are providing a list of family services to men and children beyond the list of their obligation and yet they are frowned upon and face every sort of painful criticism if they manage to perform some intellectual or social work, other than serving their husbands, children and others with food, drinks, clothes and other things. Is this Islam or social construction of gender roles in Muslim families, labelled as Islam? How long Muslim women should be standing at the crossroads – extreme Feminism at one end and extreme unnecessary restrictions on women in some Muslim families and societies at the other end?

(See Zeenath Kausar, *Muslim Women at the Crossroads*, Thinker's Library, Kuala Lumpur, 2006.)

We conclude this topic with these observations. Natural differences and natural institutions should be neither marginalised like what Gender Feminism does, nor should these differences and these institutions be manipulated to stop women from every other role and function in the society, like we find in some Muslim societies. Gender Justice requires justice to natural differences between men and women while respecting the basic equality of men and women as human beings, and as co-vicegerents of Allah so that they stand together to build and maintain healthy and stable families for a healthy and stable civilization.

Chapter 2

Baser Motives behind the Slogan of Gender Justice

The feminist concept of 'Gender Justice' is not just confined to its negative stance on the natural differences and natural institutions, 'marriage, family and motherhood, rather this concept has taken its own stance on 'sexuality' and 'reproduction' at the international level. Gender Feminists have created such havoc in the world, bringing the questions of 'gender justice' through international politics that we need spiritual courage even to discuss those problems, because they are so devastating that any human being even with little spirituality would feel ashamed to learn about them! In this article, we would highlight some of the problems which the concept, 'gender justice' has created across the world. We are only focussing here on the practical political efforts Gender Feminists are taking to achieve what they call, 'sexual and reproduction justice', the inevitable part of their concept, 'gender justice'. As far as their theories on sexuality and reproduction are concerned, their works and academic articles can be consulted and studied. This requires a critical survey of all schools of feminist thought from Classical Liberal Feminism to Gender Feminism which cannot be taken here in this article.

Baser Motives

One cannot understand the concept of ‘gender justice’ in context with ‘sexuality’ and ‘reproduction’, unless one fully explores the inner political games which the feminists are smartly manipulating through conducting grand international conferences under the auspices of the United Nations and other international organisations. We would highlight few points on two such important international Conferences, the International Conference on Population and Development, (ICPD) that took place in 1994 in Cairo and the Fourth World Conference on Women that took place in Beijing in 1995. The main objective of the ICPD was to attain sexual and reproductive autonomy for men and women so that they may enjoy sexual and reproductive justice which is an inevitable part of ‘gender justice’. Apparently, the ICPD 1994 Conference was conducted to show to the world that population control should be one of the topmost agenda for all countries and all cultures in contemporary times failing which human beings across the world would face worst consequences due to the decline and insufficiency of natural resources and some other reasons. But behind this whole propaganda was the sexual and reproductive agenda of the feminists who wanted to achieve unrestricted and unchallenged sexual and reproductive rights for women and wanted to get confidence and all kinds of support from the international community. This can be gleaned from the following words:

The main achievement of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) was what came to be known as the “Cairo Consensus,” which represented a major paradigm shift in the

population field, moving away from prior policies of imposed demographic targets aimed at reducing fertility rates (population control) to recognising women's reproductive autonomy and human rights. This shift would not have been possible without the active role of a strongly articulated and well-organised transnational feminist movement (Friedman 2003; Joachim 2003).

(See the chapter, Moving toward Sexual and Reproductive Justice by Alexandra Garita.
file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/RS100_Moving_toward_Sexual_and_Reproductive_Justice.pdf)

False Conception of Rights

Not one, several National, Regional and International Conferences took place and they are continuing from time to time to achieve sexual and reproductive autonomy, which according to them is necessary for population control, and over-all development of the countries across the world. Read this:

During the ICPD the feminist agenda to define "reproductive health" and "reproductive rights" within population policies was achieved for the first time in international development (United Nations 1994). Governments agreed that in order to stabilize population growth and achieve sustainable development, it was critical for women to have equal access to information, education, and employment, as well as to integrated health services, and respect for their sexual and reproductive choices.

file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/RS100_Moving_toward_Sexual_and_Reproductive_Justice.pdf)

The question is how these sexual and reproductive rights are connected with the population growth and sustainable development? This may be explained in these terms: In the first place, ‘sexual and reproduction rights’ are defined and secured for women through international platforms. Then, through these definitions it is made clear that religions, social traditions and cultural values and norms should not stop women from enjoying these rights.

Next, women are provided sex education and provided access to all kinds of medical services necessary for contraception and legal abortions so that women on one hand should enjoy sexual and reproductive justice and on the other hand should be given all provisions to stop pregnancy and in cases pregnancy could not be avoided, should go for legal and safe abortions. This is the connection between the sexual and reproductive justice and population growth and development. This was in fact the rationale behind all such big conferences including the Fourth World Conference on Women, FWCW, in Beijing in 1995 with the slogan of ‘women’s empowerment’.

In this Conference of 1995, in Beijing, a document was passed called, Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Here in this document, under the sections of ‘health’ ‘violence’ and ‘human rights’, all sorts of sexual and reproductive rights are demanded using different terms – mainstreaming gender perspective, gender lens, safe-sex rights, safe-abortion rights, accepting diversity in family, and many others. Thus, in this document, Platform for Action, the definitions of ‘sexual rights’ and ‘reproductive rights’ are already elaborated and accepted at the international level. See these lines:

Reproductive health therefore implies that people are able to have a satisfying and safe sex life and that they have the capability to reproduce and the freedom to decide if, when and how often to do so. Implicit in this last condition are the rights of men and women to be informed and to have access to safe, affective, affordable and acceptable methods of family planning of their choice, as well as other methods of their choice for regulation of fertility...

(See Platform for Action and the Beijing Declaration, FWCW, United Nations, Department of Public Information, New York, 1996, p. 58. For a comprehensive discussion and critical analysis of this document, Platform for Action, see Zeenath Kausar, *Women's Empowerment and Islam*, Dewan Bahasa Edition, Kuala Lumpur, 2015)

Morally Unregulated Sex

It is very clear from the above demands of sexual and reproductive rights mentioned in the Platform for Action, (which is regarded as the international instrument on women's rights) that on one side the feminists demanded absolute sexual and reproductive rights and on the other side they demanded all medical facilities to prevent pregnancy and if need arises go for safe abortion. It is important to note that hundreds of feminists are working consistently to attain these demands and are taking all possible measures to stop all those organisations from different countries and cultures which do not agree with their sexual and reproductive agendas. For this they form several networks and NGOs and they are generously funded by those governments and other philanthropic bodies who share their agendas and efforts. Read these lines:

After Beijing a network of transnational feminists formed a group called HERA (Health, Equality, Rights, Accountability), which worked on follow-up negotiations (the Cairo and Beijing +5 reviews), once again creating a formidable force against religious and political fundamentalisms and gaining ground for women's and adolescent sexuality and human rights....These successes were due to two main factors: strong feminist leaders (both in New York and in the South) at the helm of organisations that many of them had founded, and the confidence of and significant investments by the donor community (both northern governments and private philanthropy) in feminist leadership to influence global policy.

(file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/RS100_Moving_toward_Sexual_and_Reproductive_Justice.pdf)

This shows that besides the International Conferences, several international organisations of Feminists are working all over the world under different names to gain 'gender justice' and they are intellectually and financially supported by the so-called advanced nations and cultures of the world. Why? These organisations provide sufficient knowledge and information on sexual and reproductive issues for women and also provide them with necessary medical services in this connection. Here it seems necessary to mention one of the big organisations working for this cause, International Planned Parenthood Federation, IPPF founded in 1952. This Federation provides sexual and reproductive health services for hundreds and thousands of people all over the world and spend millions of dollars in this connection. The Vision, Mission and the Core Values of this Federation are as follows:

Vision

All people are free to make choices about their sexuality and well-being, in a world free of discrimination.

Mission

Building on a proud history of more than 60 years of achievement, we commit to lead a locally owned, globally connected civil society movement that provides and enables services and champion's sexual and reproductive health and rights for all, especially the under-served.

Core values

Our core values guide the way we undertake our work. We believe:

in social inclusion with a demonstrated commitment to enable the rights of the most under-served to be realised

in diversity, respecting all regardless of their age, gender, status, identity, sexual orientation or expression

our passion and determination inspire others to have the courage to challenge and seek social justice for all

<http://www.ippf.org/about-us>

There are two more points which should be noted here. One is concerned with 'diversity and sexual orientation' and the other concerned with 'the rights of the most under-served'. By 'diversity and sexual orientation' they imply acceptance and promotion of all kinds of sexuality – lesbianism, homosexuality, transgenderism, queer and all others. And by 'under-

served' they imply people from the so-called undeveloped and underdeveloped countries.

What is the politics behind all these efforts? The same agenda – promotion of sexual and reproduction rights! People from the poor countries are approached and are provided information and practical medical services so that they may enjoy all kinds of sexuality 'safely' without any coercion from anywhere and should be also provided the needed medical facilities to provide 'sexual and reproductive justice' to them. It is pertinent to mention here that IPPF Member Associations have supported young boys and men for the same cause and has come up recently with what is called – A new collection of Case Studies – The Men and Boys Collection: Stories of Gender Justice and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights. What is this collection of stories about? Read these lines:

From Bolivia to Indonesia and Palestine to Zambia – 12 personal stories from 12 countries across the globe provide personal accounts of the journeys that men and boys are making in their sexual and reproductive lives and as champions for 'gender justice'.

<http://www.ippf.org/resource/men-and-boys-collection-stories-gender-justice-and-sexual-and-reproductive-health-and>

Promotion of Immorality

Besides International Conferences and International Organisations, some other political ways and means are adopted to promote their agenda of 'sexual and reproductive justice'. Young boys and girls who are refugees from the countries on war are provided the so-called sex-education and other needed

services in the name of 'sexual justice' and 'human rights'. We would give here one example of those unfortunate young boys and girls who became the victims of wars in their countries and left their countries to find some safety in some other countries. Some groups of boys and girls from Afghanistan, Eritrea, Syria and Iraq reached Sweden due to the wars in their countries. According to a Report, between 2015 and 2016 more than 160,000 people sought asylum – over 35,000 of those were unaccompanied minors. According to a report by Human Rights Watch (HRW), these young people suffered persecution and violence. At the same time, the report says that they lack knowledge on sex education and relationships. Hence it is pointed out that the Swedish Association for Sexuality Education in Sweden (RFSU), a member association of IPPF, has been trying to help these young boys and girls to provide sexual health lessons to them. Below we would present some of their statements to show how they are feeling about this new experience on so-called 'sex education and relationships':

Nineteen-year-old Zilan Karim from Kurdistan and 20-year-old Masume Ahmadi from Afghanistan have benefited from RFSU's sex education classes at their school in Uppsala in eastern Sweden.

Masume said: "In our home countries we're supposed to have some sex education, but the teachers often tear those pages out of the biology books. The subject of sex is taboo."

Zilan says: "It was also useful to learn about Swedish rights and rules. For example what to do if someone has sex with you against your will, and that you can have an abortion."

Seventeen-year-old, Mahdi Rezaie who came to Sweden alone three years ago, and whose family fled from Afghanistan to Iran when he was 6, said: "I was surprised to learn that two men, or two women, can date each other in Sweden. In Iran homosexuality is punishable by death if discovered."

Mahdi added: "The best part was to learn about having sex and how to protect oneself against STDs."

<http://www.ippf.org/blogs/young-asylum-seekers-need-know-more-about-sex>

Cultural Aggression

What does all this mean? International political manipulation of the war victims to assimilate them in those societies and cultures which are ideologically and culturally different from them so that they leave the teachings and values of their own countries and their own respective cultures! Is this 'justice'? Is this 'social justice'? Is this 'gender justice'? This is sheer injustice against their cultures and against their civilizations! These poor, insecure and shelter-less refugees of war from countries like Afghanistan, Syria and Iraq are fully brain-washed through this kind of sex-education and they are made to feel happy and content with this kind of life, which is totally different from their original home countries. All this is done so that they get absorbed well in this kind of culture where sex is perceived independent from marital relationship to which they call 'sex and relationship education'. Can anybody ask them: What kind of 'relationship' they want to provide to these young boys and girls based on this kind of 'sex and relationship education' whereas they belong to that Islamic

civilization where sex without marriage is absolutely forbidden?

Now let me give you one more example of the international politics on ‘gender justice’.

On 23rd January 2017, the new President of the United States, Donald Trump stopped providing US aid to foreign organisations which work for providing information regarding abortions and which also help people with necessary medical services for abortions. It is important to note here that the US has been the biggest global funder for family planning services. This ban on the biggest fund for abortion services fell like a bomb-shell to all the big international Family Planning Centres and Associations because it is a big loss for them and for those who get benefitted from the abortion services. For this reason, the opponents of this US ban on abortion funding call this ban, ‘the Global Gag Rule’, (GGR) while others call it ‘the Mexico City Policy’, because quite earlier, the President Regan banned this funding in one of the Conferences held in Mexico.

The whole thing is this issue of banning and lifting the abortion fund is very much connected with the Democratic and Republican parties in the United States. “The rule stayed in place under President George H.W. Bush and then was rescinded by President Bill Clinton in January 1993. When President George W. Bush came into office in 2001, he imposed the rule that Jan. 22 – the 23rd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court Case that legalised abortion in the United States. President Barack Obama lifted the rule eight years later. Hence it is observed that ‘the move drew immediate denunciations from

family-planning groups and their Democratic allies and praise from pro-life officials and Republicans.'

www.washingtonpost.com/news/to-your-health/wp/2017/01/23/trump-reverses-abortion-related-policy-to-ban-funding-to-intern

Issue of Abortion

An important point to note is that this issue of stopping the abortion fund by the US is not an issue only between the political parties in the United States, rather it is a global issue, because it is pointed out that millions of poor women in the poor countries would be badly affected by this ban. Tewodros Melesse, the Director General of International Planned Parenthood Federation, IPPF stated: "The expansion of the GGR (or Mexico City Policy) will deny critical health care to many of the poorest women on the planet, forcing millions of them into unplanned pregnancies, unsafe abortions and leading to thousands of deaths." According to an estimate of IPPF, the US ban on abortion funding 'will lead to an additional 20,000 maternal deaths, 4.8 million unintended pregnancies and 1.7 million unsafe abortions.'

<http://www.ippf.org/news/global-gag-rule-expansion-will-leave-fatal-legacy-generations>

It should be noted here that according to the Guttmacher Institute, the US donates \$600/- million a year as foreign assistance for family planning which help 27 million women to receive contraceptive services. It is pointed out that in the year 2016, two million unsafe abortions could be avoided.

<https://www.bustle.com/p/how-many-countries-are-affected-by-the-global-gag-rule-donald-trumps-executive-order-will-have-a-major-impact-32449>

Critical reflections on this whole issue would reveal that all the international financial efforts which are taken to resolve the sexual and reproductive health problems by the above mentioned International Organisations are not at all the right solutions to resolve the problems. We assert that these kinds of sexual and reproduction health problems seem to be a self-created cyclical problem – first these Gender Feminists demand sexual and reproduction justice without marriage; then they demand rights for contraception and abortions and all related medical help; then they need millions of funds for this purpose. Then, if they get funds, they help women either for contraception, avoiding pregnancy or help them for abortion and then give them the needed services to prevent HIV and AIDS. Thus this cycle of sexual and reproduction problems continue as never-ending. Hence, we argue that promotion of contraceptive devices and abortions are not the solutions to these kinds of sexual and reproduction health problems, rather they are the extensions of the problems! Sexual health and reproduction health issues are not the real problems, because all those who are married have rights to enjoy a well-balanced sexual and reproduction health. The problem lies in the demand for the unrestrained and marriage-free demands for sexual and reproduction rights which leads to the demands for contraceptive devices and abortions which in turn demands heavy funds and comprehensive medical services wherein comes the international politics to resolve the problem.

Permissiveness

It seems also pertinent to mention here that all what we have discussed concerning various efforts and strategic measures the gender feminists have been taking to promote their agenda, sexual and reproduction justice, can be traced back to what is called the goal of 'sexual revolution' as proposed by the Radical feminists during 1960s and 70s and continued to 80s giving rise to permissive society and marriage-free sexual expressions and relationships. The term 'sexual revolution' started appearing in 1920s in the West. An eye catching chapter, Sexual Revolution appeared in one of the popular books that attracted attention of the people, *Is Sex Necessary*, by James Thurber and E. B. White, published in 1929. The book discussed love, marriage and romance and related topics and it is still widely published with a series of editions and widely read. However, it was from the 1960s, that discussions on the need for a sexual revolution increased tremendously challenging heterosexual marriage and demanding pre-marital and extra-marital sex, alternative forms of sexuality, normalisation of contraception and legalisation of abortions. Psychologists and scientists like Sigmund Freud, Wilhelm Reich, Alfred Kinsey and others greatly influenced the sexual revolution.

Besides these scientists, feminists during this period were also very much influenced by the writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels who argued that women are exploited under Capitalism and that they should seek liberation in the abolition of family and Capitalism. Feminists like Shulamith Firestone argued for the abolition of biological family and Kate Millet argued for the destruction of marriage and demanded

sexual revolution. Simon de Beauvoir, Mary Daly and many other influential feminists presented more or less the same views on marriage and family. This line of argument reached its climax in modern and contemporary times when Gender Feminists call for a natural polymorphous perverse sexuality which is free from every kind of religious and social restrictions. Hence there is nothing surprising to see the international politics playing its own games on sexuality and reproduction issues, because women who are influenced by this sexual revolution get trapped in sexual and reproduction problems and end their lives fighting these self-created problems, and International Organisations standing on the big funds of the so-called advanced countries come to rescue them because these countries neither find any problem in the demands of these feminists for sexual and reproduction autonomy nor do they find problems when hundreds and thousands of women across the world are throwing themselves in marriage-free sex and either adopt the condom taking culture or go for abortions. According to these so-called advanced countries, these are women rights and human rights.

Victims of Deception

As a whole, as mentioned above, it is a cycle of problems that the concepts of 'gender justice', 'human rights' and 'women's empowerment' have created and entangled women from all sides. As long as feminists would denounce connection of sexuality and reproduction with 'marriage' as discrimination, coercion and violence, and as long as they continue with their philosophy, 'my body my rights', the problems may continue. See below one of the

statements of UN Women Executive Director Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka at the High-level Thematic Debate on advancing gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls, on 6th March 2015 at UN Headquarters in New York:

Women can make decisions about their bodies, health and sexuality, free from discrimination, violence and coercion....

<http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2015/3/pgae-speech>

In short, this is the feminist concept of ‘gender justice’ which on one side undermines the gender differences, and natural institutions, marriage, family and motherhood as discussed in the earlier article and on the other side strongly believes and whole-heartedly supports and promotes through international political means the unrestricted and marriage-free sexual and reproductive rights of women and support the promotion of contraceptive devices and abortions in the name of justice and women’s empowerment.

As far as the Islamic stance on sexuality and reproduction is concerned, it is very clear and concrete. Islam totally rejects all kinds of sexuality outside marriage as forbidden, ‘haram’. Islam in fact emphasises that all doors that lead to sexual problems in a society should be forbidden, so that men and women lead a pure and chaste life and keep the social environment clean and safe. The Qur’ān says:

And do not come near to adultery, it is a shameful deed and an evil, and opening the road to other evils.

(Al Qur’ān, 24: 2)

Hence in Islam, sex without the institution of marriage is denounced illegitimate, illegal and a major sin. Therefore all sorts of pre-marital and extra-marital

relationships are all strictly forbidden in Islam. There are many verses in the Qur'ān which clearly forbid fornication, adultery and any form of sexual indulgence that falls outside the marital relationship between man and woman. See the verses (23:5-6).

Concept of Ethical Boundaries

The main point to understand here is that in Islam, all aspects of life including sexuality is expected to be disciplined and regulated in such a way that it should neither be condemned and forbidden altogether, nor should it transgress the moral boundaries and become a harmful and destructive element in society. In fact, even sexual relations are expected to be based on certain Islamic injunctions and etiquette. Furthermore, observing Islamic injunctions on sexual relationships are perceived as 'ibadah', service to Allah. The same goes with reproduction in Islam. Sexuality and reproduction are all directly tied to marriage without which there can be neither sexual relations nor reproduction. Hence, Islam forbids all those newly invented reproduction-aid and reproduction-control technologies which give way to adultery. Islam accepts only those technologies in which the husband and wife are involved to beget children, no third person. Furthermore, Islam strongly condemns the condom culture where young girls and boys are allowed to involve in sexual relations without any recourse to marriage and are encouraged to use condoms to prevent pregnancy.

At the same time Islam also condemns abortions without any genuine reason, i.e. only if the life of the mother is in danger. Islam does not allow abortions for the fear of financial reasons. The Qur'ān says:

And do not kill your children for fear of poverty. We provide for them and for you. Indeed, their killing is ever a great sin. (Al Qur'ān, 17:31)

Islam also condemns deviant sexuality, lesbianism, homosexuality, transexuality and all other non-marital and non-heterosexual unions. Islam calls all these kinds of sexual relationships as practices of ignorance, 'jahiliyyah' which should be forbidden. The Qur'ān says:

And [We had sent] Loote (Lot) when he said to his people, Do you commit such immorality as no one has preceded you with from among the world's [i.e. People]? Indeed, you approach men with desire, instead of women. Rather, you are a transgressing people. [Quran 7:80-81]

Do you indeed approach men with desire instead of women? Rather, you are a people behaving ignorantly." (27:55)

Rejection of Illegitimate Sex

All these injunctions of the Qur'ān on sexuality show clearly that Islam rejects all those marriage-free sexual and reproduction rights which feminists have been demanding in the name of gender justice, and women's empowerment. The thing is, Islam rejects the feminist philosophy of sexuality and reproduction – 'my body my rights'. Islam would raise these questions to them: On what basis, feminists can say that they are the owners of their bodies? Are they self-created beings? Nobody can claim that he or she is self-created. The whole creation belongs to Allah and He alone can determine what are the rights and obligations of people for each other. Human beings have no 'rights' to define their 'rights' on their own

unless they take guidance from those sources of knowledge which are ordained from the Creator of the human beings and the universe, the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, the Prophetic traditions. Other than this, if human beings take the liberty of defining their rights on their own, then those 'rights' may turn out to be 'wrongs'. This is what is happening when the feminists define their rights on their own and get trapped in a series of problems from where it becomes too hard to come out.

An important reason behind the failure of the feminist philosophy on sexuality and reproduction is that it goes against the very nature of man. Originally, man is created as a very noble creature as pointed out in the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān says:

*We have certainly created man in the best of stature.
(Al Qur'ān, 95:4)*

But if man does not follow the injunctions of Allah, then he fights against his own original nature and descends down to the lowest level, even below the level of animals. The Qur'ān says:

*We have indeed created man in the best of moulds,
Then We render him the lowest of the low, Save those
who believe and do righteous deeds, for them is a
reward unending. (Al Qur'ān, 95:4-6)*

At the end of this article, we feel compelled to invite the attention of our readers that all around the humanity in general and Muslim Ummah in particular, complex, serious and urgent political problems are being mounted from all the sides; several pressing and intricate economic problems have encircled from all corners and a series of educational and cultural problems are lying as fundamental problems before the

humanity and the Muslim Ummah. On top of all these, we find these kinds of sexual and reproduction problems over-powering the nerve and soul of mankind and Muslim Ummah which may plunder and destroy the lives of millions of young boys and girls in its Tsunami of sexual revolution, if remain unchecked and uncontrolled. We think that this should be taken as a 'wake-up call' for all those Muslim men and women scholars and leaders who are conscious of their responsibilities towards humanity to come forward and break this vicious chain of evils. There is an urgent need to write, to speak and to do whatever possible, of course through wisdom and peaceful means to stop these international political manoeuvrings of Gender Feminists and their collaboration with the so-called international organisations and so-called advanced countries and the United Nations for the promotion of this irresponsible sexual and reproduction autonomy and to stop those millions of dollars that are being spent for letting thousands of men and women fall in religiously, morally and humanly forbidden sexual indulgence which are reducing them from the high level platform of human beings to the level of beasts being deceived in the name of 'sexual and reproduction justice'.

